

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

STEVEN A. ODOM,

Petitioner,

v.

BRYAN MORRISON,

Respondent.

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-12180
HONORABLE ARTHUR J. TARNOW
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**OPINION AND ORDER DIRECTING RESPONDENT TO FILE AN
ANSWER TO THE MOTION FOR BOND AND THE MOTION FOR
IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF THE EMERGENCY MOTION FOR
BOND (ECF Nos. 7, 11).**

Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, challenging his state convictions. Respondent has yet to file an answer, although ordered to do so. Pending before the Court are petitioner's two motions for bond.

In order to receive bond pending a decision on the merits of a habeas corpus petition, a petitioner must show a substantial claim of law based on the facts and exceptional circumstances justifying special treatment in the interest of justice. *Lee v. Jabe*, 989 F.2d 869, 871 (6th Cir. 1993)(quoting *Dotson v. Clark*, 900 F.2d 77, 79 (6th Cir. 1990)); *see also Nash v. Eberlin*, 437 F.3d 519, 526, n. 10 (6th Cir. 2006). There will be few occasions where a habeas petitioner meets this standard. *Dotson*, 900 F.2d at 79. Federal

courts may grant bail when granting the writ. *See Sizemore v. District Court*, 735 F.2d 204, 208 (6th Cir. 1984). By implication, a federal court should not grant bail under other circumstances.

Petitioner argues that he has demonstrated a substantial claim of law, and that the Covid-19 pandemic, and his age and health issues justify his release on bond. Respondent has not responded to petitioner's motion. The Court will direct Respondent to respond.

Based on the foregoing, respondent is ordered to respond to petitioner's bond motions by March 1, 2021.

s/Arthur J. Tarnow
ARTHUR J. TARNOW
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: February 22, 2021